UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/476,156	12/30/1999	PETER M. BONUTTI	BON-4687	7407

				EXAMINER
33771	7590	10/28/2003		CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T

PAUL D. BIANCO: FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS,
GUTMAN, BONGINI, & BIANCO P.L.
601 BRICKELL KEY DRIVE, SUITE 404
MIAMI, FL 33131 .

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/476,156	BONUTTI, PETER M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Srirama Channavajjala	2177	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 September 2003</u> .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>62-108</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>62-108</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

     1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

     2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

     3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .   6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Examiner acknowledges applicants' response filed on 9/11/2003, paper no.15.

2.   Claims 62-108 are pending in this application.

3.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/31/2003 has been entered, paper no. # 10, the Amendment filed on 3/6/2003, paper no. # 8, paper no. # 12 has been entered, and a non-final Office action, paper no. # 13 as stated below.

4.   Examiner acknowledges applicants' preliminary amendment filed on 3/31/2003, paper no. # 11.

5.   Claims 106-108 have been added, paper no. # 11.

6.   Claims 62-63,65-66,86-87,91-100,102-105 have been amended, paper no.8

7.   Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment filed on 11/4/2002, paper no.6.

8.   Claims 1-61 have been cancelled, paper no. # 6.

9.   Claims 62-105 have been added, paper no. # 6.

10.   Claims 62, and 96 are independent Claims.

Drawings

11.   The drawing filed on 12/30/1999 is <u>approved</u> by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152.

12.   Examiner approved applicants' proposed drawings fig 2 through 4, a copy of approved drawings are herewith enclosed with this office action, and formal drawings are required in response to this office action, paper no. # 13.

13.   The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims, at least <u>flow chart(s) or diagrams</u>, for example, **<u>disseminating information relating to litigation pending in a plurality of courts of law, said method comprising the steps of reviewing records in a plurality of courts of law to obtain data relating to lawsuits filed in each of the plurality of courts of law, said step of reviewing records in a plurality of courts of law includes determining the identity of the plaintiff, determining the identity of the defendant, determining the cause of action, and determining the identity of the attorney or attorneys filing the lawsuits, transmitting the data obtained from the records in each court of law of the plurality of courts of law to a database, said step of transmitting data ....access the database.......</u>** , must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Applicant required to provide a detailed **<u>drawings/figures</u>** including a clear flow chart **<u>explaining each logical step(s) with appropriate reference label or sign</u>**.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Information Disclosure Statement

14.   The information disclosure statement filed on 1/19/2000, paper no. # 4, has been considered and a copy was enclosed with this office action, paper no. # 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15.   Claims 62-105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Heckman et al. [hereafter Heckman], US Patent No. 5875431 in view of Maxwell,

US Patent No.-6098070.

16.   As to Claims 62, 96,106, Heckman teaches a system which including

'disseminating information relating to litigation pending in a plurality of courts of law,

said method comprising the steps of reviewing court records in a plurality of courts of

law to obtain data relating to lawsuits filed in each of the plurality of courts of law' [fig 1,

col 5, line 61-67, col 6, line 1-7, col 8, line 21-36], litigation corresponds to Heckman's

fig 1, element 14, plurality courts corresponds to court system that including local courts

as detailed in col 8, line 22-25, reviewing court records in a plurality of courts of law '

[col 8, ·line 38-52, col 9, line 7-18, col 20, line 18-24], court records are integral part of

Heckman's court system because Heckman's court system also including for example

local court rules as detailed at col 8, line 31-32, 'transmitting the data obtained from the

records in each court of law of the plurality of courts of law to a database' [fig 2, col 21,

line 43-58], database corresponds to fig 2, element21, element 72, 'transmitting the

publicly available data obtained from the records of each court of plurality of courts of law includes transmitting data indicative of the identity of the plaintiff, the attorneys filing the lawsuits' [col 24, line 5-10], as best understood by the examiner, publicly available data corresponds to the data accessible by the user through service provider for example as detailed in fig 2, element 25, further it is noted that Heckman specifically directed to computerized management of legal activities associated with litigation and legal transactions and like [see col 1, line 24-27], it is also noted that Heckman teaches for example various workstations, law firm computer, law service , historical case database etc., are connected through telecommunications network, therefore, as best understood by the examiner, Heckman not only teaches external databases such as Lexis, Idex or dialog which are service providers for publicly available data, but also suggests both transmitting and receiving information over telecommunication network [see fig 2, col 21, line 45-49], ' accessing the database with terminals which communicate with the database by a network, and transmitting at least a portion of the data from the database over the network to the terminals which access the database over the network' [fig 2, col 21, line 51-67, col 22, line 1-11], Heckman specifically teaches various databases for example historical case database element 26, database element 72, 21, and 17 are connected through telecommunications means that including local area network, LAN server storage, service provider, further Heckman also teaches for example workstation(s) or terminal(s) element 18.

It is however, noted that Heckman does not specifically teach ' identity of the

plaintiff, identity of defendant, cause of action, identity of attorney or attorneys', although

Heckman teaches for example case development management, specifically identifying

for example plaintiff, defendant, multiple specialties, collection of detailed report, and

other related constraints for developing a strong case that including staffing for the case

as detailed in col 8, line 53-67. On the other hand, Maxwell teaches a system which

including 'identity of the plaintiff, identity of defendant, cause of action, identity of

attorney or attorneys' [col 3, line 10-49, table 1A-1C, table III, table V], Maxwell

specifically directed to case management for clients, attorneys, law office using

relational database, particularly creating various relational tables that has unique

identifiers such as client ID, attorney ID [see table V], defendant ID [see table III],

and like.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to incorporate the teachings of Maxwell into legal strategic analysis planning

and evaluation control system of Heckman et al. because they are both directed to

electronic case management [see Heckman: Abstract, col 5, line 61-67; Maxwell:

Abstract, col 2, line 64-67], more specifically Heckman is directed to strategic planning

control or computer based legal strategic planning system that dynamically tracking the

current legal system that including litigation planning , see col 6, line 24-44, while

Maxwell is directed to electronic case management specifically including relational

database manager containing various tables that are linked through certain identical

and unique fields such as detailed in col 3, line 7-49, table1A-1C,table II-XXVIII, and are

both from the same field of endeavor. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention would have been motivated to combined the references because that would

have allowed users of Heckman legal strategic analysis planning and evaluation control

system to control, track and obtain necessary information that is automatically

generated, further bringing the advantages of classifying required data in a relational

structure and a arranged for managing the data structure to allow users to generate

required necessary documents as suggested by Maxwell, see col 3, line 1-5.

17.   As to Claims 63, 98,100-101 Heckman teaches a system which including

'reviewing court records of a plurality of courts of law includes determining the

disposition of lawsuits field in each court of law of the plurality of courts of law' [fig 1,

col 5, line 61-67, col 6, line 1-7, col 8, line 21-36], plurality courts corresponds to court

system that including local courts as detailed in col 8, line 22-25, reviewing court

records of a plurality of courts of law ' [col 8, line 38-52, col 9, line 7-18, col 20,

line 18-24], 'transmitting the publicly available data obtained from the court records of

each court of law of the plurality of courts of law includes transmitting data...... [fig 2,

col 21, line 43-58], database corresponds to Heckman's fig 2, element 21,72,

'transmitting data indicative of the disposition of lawsuits filed in each court of law of the

plurality of courts of law to the database' [fig 1-2], disposition of case is part of

Heckman's teaching because Heckman specifically directed to updating the data and

final outcome of the litigation tasks as detailed in fig 1, element 5. It is further noted that

Maxwell specifically teaches establishing relations between various tables in a relational

database management [col 2, line 64-67].

18.   As to Claim 64, the limitation of this claim has been noted in the rejection of

above claim 1. In addition, Heckman teaches 'transmitting at least a portion of the data

from the database to the terminals which access the database includes transmitting

data ....[fig 1-2, col 22, line 3-11].

19.   As to Claim 65, Heckman teaches a system which including 'reviewing court

records of a plurality of courts of law includes visually reviewing the court records and

manually copying the publicly available data from the court records of each court of law

of the plurality of courts of law' [fig 3, col 22, line 12-25].

20.   As to Claim 66, Heckman teaches a system which including 'reviewing court

records of a plurality of courts of law includes electronically reading data from an

electronic version of the court records of each court of law of the plurality of courts of

law, said step of transmitting the data obtained from the records in each court of law of

the plurality of courts of law includes electronically transmitting data to the data storage

device' [col 21, line 63-66, col 24, line 42-51]. Electronically reading, transmitting

information is integral part of Heckman's teachings because Heckman specifically

directed to using computer programs that are part of legal strategic analysis planning

system.

21.   As to Claims 67, 77, 99, the limitation of this claim has been noted in the

rejection of above claim 1. In addition, Maxwell teaches a system which including

'determining a relationship between a number corresponding to the number of lawsuits

in which one attorney represented litigants in a plurality of courts of law' [col 18, line 26-

45], Maxwell teaches database management program, more specifically relational

database management in which various tables have been linked or established

relationship between various tables based on unique Ids such as Attorney ID field, court

ID field and like as detailed in col 18, line 26-45], therefore, litigant represented by the

one attorney in the plurality of courts of law is specifically located based on attorney ID,

court ID fields as detailed in col 18, tablesXXVI,XXVII, 'transmitting data from the

database to at least one of the terminals indicative of the relationship between the

number of lawsuits in which the one attorney represented litigants in the plurality of

courts of law and the number of lawsuits decided in favor of litigants represented by the

one attorney in the plurality of courts of law' [col 18, line 59-67, col 19, line 1-3, fig 1].

22.   As to Claims 68, 97, the limitation of this claim has been noted in the rejection of

above claim 1. In addition, Maxwell teaches a system which including 'attorney

represented plaintiffs in a plurality of courts of law and a number corresponding to the

number of lawsuits decided in favor of plaintiffs represented by the one attorney in the

plurality of courts of law' [col 3, line 1-4, line 18-20], 'transmitting data from the database

to at least one of the terminals indicative of the relationship between the number of

lawsuits in which the one attorney represented plaintiffs in the plurality of courts law and

the number of lawsuits decided in favor of a plaintiff represented by the one attorney in

the plurality of courts of law' [col 4, line 6-11, table1A-1C], further it is noted that

Maxwell specifically directed to establishing relationship between various tables based

on the unique identifier or unique Ids such as attorney ID, file number client ID, court ID

as detailed in various tables.

23.   As to Claim 69, the limitation of this claim has been noted in the rejection of

above claim 1. In addition, Maxwell teaches a system which including 'attorney

represented defendants in the plurality of courts of law and the number of lawsuits

decided in favor of defendants represented by the one attorney in the plurality of courts

of law' [col 8, line 31-40, table 1A-1C], Maxwell specifically suggests each defendant

must have a unique defendant ID field in the database table, further this would allow

establishing relationship among other related table(s) to get required information.

24.   As to Claim 70, the limitation of this claim has been noted in the rejection of

above claim 1. In addition, Maxwell teaches a system which including 'lawsuits in which

one law firm represented litigants in a plurality of courts of law' [table 1C], Maxwell

specifically suggests firm or law firm, attorney that belongs to firm, and courts that ---

identifies what kind of court(s) as detailed in table 1C, further Maxwell teaches for

example establishing relationship between various fields in the relational database as

detailed in various tables.

25.   The limitations of Claims 71-72 are rejected in the analysis of above Claim(s) and are rejected on that basis.

26.   As to Claim 73, the limitation of this claim has been noted in the rejection of above claim 1. In addition, Maxwell teaches a system which including 'relationship between a number corresponding to the number of lawsuits relating to one specific type of cause of action in which one attorney represented litigants in a plurality of courts of law' [col 8, line 31-49, fig 5A-B], Maxwell suggests for example establishing relationship among various tables that including attorney representing client(s) based on unique id such as attorney ID, client ID, and specific type of cause that corresponds to incident type as detailed in table VI, further it is also noted that Maxwell specifically teaches various courts that corresponds to court ID that identifies court as detailed in table XII litigation table structure.

27.   As to Claim 74-75, the limitation of this claim has been noted in the rejection of above claim 1. In addition, Maxwell teaches a system which including 'specific type of cause of action and in which the one attorney represented plaintiffs in the plurality of courts of law and the number of lawsuits relating to the one specific type of cause of action and which were decided in favor of plaintiffs represented by the one attorney in the plurality of courts of law' [col 3, line 1-5, col8, line 31-40], Maxwell specifically teaches relationship between various tables that are specifically directed to for example

file number that related to attorney ID, court ID, client ID, defendant ID as detailed in col 17-18.

28.   As to Claim 76, the limitation of this claim has been noted in the rejection of above claim 1. In addition, Heckman teaches a system which including 'decision by a judge or a jury and the number of lawsuits in which the one attorney represented a litigant and which resulted in a decision by a judge or a jury favorable to a litigant represented by the one attorney' [col 8, line 22-36], 'transmitting data from the database to at least one of the terminals indicative of the relationship between the number of lawsuits in which the one attorney represented a litigant and which resulted in a decision by a judge or a jury and the number of lawsuits in which the one attorney represented a litigant and which resulted in a decision by a judge or a jury favorable to a litigant represented by the one attorney' [fig 2, col 25, line 17-29].

29.   As to Claim 78-79, the limitation of this claim has been noted in the rejection of above claim 1. In addition, Maxwell teaches a system which including 'determining the number of lawsuits relating to each of a plurality of different causes of action filed by one attorney' [col 17, table XXVII], Maxwell specifically teaches file name that uniquely identifies specific case that related to specific causes, therefore, different causes may be part of specific file or a file may be created based on different causes and vice versa as detailed in col 18, line 26-44].

30.   As to Claim 80-81, 88-90, the limitation of this claim has been noted in the rejection of above claim 1. In addition, Maxwell teaches a system which including 'determining the number of lawsuits which were appealed from a lower court to a higher court and which involved a litigant represented by one attorney' [col 18, line 43-44, table XXVII], Maxwell specifically teaches for example uniquely identifying not only court though Court ID, but also location of court for example county, jurisdiction and like as detailed in table XXVII, therefore, lower court, higher court have been defined in the data structure field name with appropriate description, reference as detailed in col 18, line 5-13.

31.   As to Claims 82-83, the limitation of this claim has been noted in the rejection of above claim 1. In addition, Maxwell teaches a system which including 'determining the relationship between a number of lawsuits decided in favor of a plaintiff by each judge of a plurality of judges in each of a plurality of courts of law to a number of lawsuits decided by each judge of the plurality of judges' [col 17, line 55-67, col 18, line 5-13], Maxwell specifically teaches for example each judge is uniquely identified by Judge ID similar to defendant ID, client ID, Court ID and further establishing relationship between various table structure , see col 9-18 tables.

32.   The limitation of Claims 84-85 has been rejected in the analysis above, and these limitations have been rejected on that basis.

33.   As to Claims 86-87, 105, the limitation of this claim has been noted in the
rejection of above claim 1. In addition, Maxwell teaches a system which including
'identity of expert witnesses for at least one cause of action of the plurality of different
causes of action in each of the plurality of courts' [col 12, line 19-34], Maxwell
specifically teaches for example witnesses table structure that uniquely identifies not
only witness name, but also witness related attributes with reference as detailed in
table X.

34.   As to Claims 91-95,102-104, the limitation of this claim has been noted in the
rejection of above claim 1. In addition, both Maxwell and Heckman teaches
'transmitting the publicly available data includes transmitting data relating to lawsuits'
[Maxwell: fig 1, Heckman: 2], both Heckman and Maxwell teaches network in which
information not only transmit, but also receive [see Heckman: fig 2; Maxwell, fig 1,
element 115], further it is noted that Maxwell teaches lawsuits filed within a period of
time in each of a plurality of courts of law' [col 13, line 25-33, col 14, line 41-42, table
XIII, XVI], Maxwell specifically teaches for example litigation table structure that
uniquely identifies trial data, trial time, court ID, file number as detailed in table XIII so
that it is possible to track specific case status in specific court(s).

35.   As to Claims 107-108, Maxwell teaches a system which including 'complaints,

answers and motion filed by the parties' [see fig 2, col 18, line 64-67, col 19, line 1-3],

Maxwell specifically suggests various types of information such as detailed in fig 2 that

also including 'motions related data'.

Response to Arguments

36.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 62-108 have been considered, but

they are not persuasive, for examiner's response, see discussion below:

At page 2-3, remarks regarding drawings: Although Applicant submitted drawings

fig 2-4, and approved, still it is not clear from the drawings how and who determines the

identify of the defendant, cause of action, identity of attorney or attorneys filing the

lawsuits and like, therefore, applicant is hereby required to provide at least a flow chart

showing each logical step(s) with appropriate reference label(s) in response to this

office action, paper no. # 16.

a)   At page 4, line 20-26, line 27-28, page 5, line 1-1-5, Claims 62,96, Heckman

does not disclose a method of disseminating information relating to litigation..........

b)   At page 5, line 6-11, claims 106, Heckman does not teach or suggest a system of

disseminating litigation information.................

As to the above arguments [a-b], examiner disagree with the applicant because

firstly, Heckman is directed to legal strategic analysis planning system, more specifically

computer based legal strategic planning control system [see Abstract], secondly,

Heckman specifically directed to dynamically monitoring, collecting information related

to legal practices [see Abstract], further Heckman specifically teaches

telecommunication network on which information is not only transmitted, but also

received from various sources [see fig 2]. As clearly detailed above, court records are

integral part of Heckman's court system because Heckman's court system also

including for example local court rules as detailed at col 8, line 31-32. Thirdly, Heckman

specifically teaches various databases for example historical case database element

26, database element 72, 21, and 17 are connected through telecommunications means

that including local area network, LAN server storage, service provider, further

Heckman also teaches for example workstation(s) or terminal(s) element 18.], It is

noted that Heckman teaches for example various workstations, law firm computer

system, law service , historical case database etc., are connected through

telecommunications network, therefore, as best understood by the examiner, Heckman

not only teaches external databases such as Lexis, Idex or dialog which are well known

service providers for publicly available data, but also suggests both transmitting and

receiving information over telecommunication network [see fig 2, col 21, line 45-49].

c)   At page 8, line 6-7, Claim 62 and 96, applicant argues 'publicly available daa

relating to filed lawsuits be.............

        As to the above argument [c], as best understood by the examiner, Heckman is

directed to computer based legal strategic analysis, dynamically tracking of current legal

information related to various vases as detailed in Abstract, further it is noted that

Heckman also suggests for example Lexis, IDEX and other resources where user can

substribe for information publicly available legal information such as lawsuits, court

records and like [col 20, line 33-35].

d)   At page 9, line 16-19, 62,96,106 Maxwell does not teach or suggest the claimed

features of the present invention...........

As to the above argument [d], Maxwell is directed to relational database

management that manages electronic case information related to law, more specifically

information related to plaintiffs, defendants, law offices and like [see Abstract, col 18,

line 26-44], it is noted Maxwell maintains various case related information for example

witness table, expert witnesses table, litigation table, deposition table and like [col 3, line

11-48], further Maxwell suggests for example specific court table in which courts have

been identified by the court ID [see col 18, table XXVIII]. It is however, noted that

Heckman does not specifically teach ' identity of the plaintiff, identity of defendant,

cause of action, identity of attorney or attorneys', although Heckman teaches for

example case development management, specifically identifying for example plaintiff,

defendant, multiple specialties, collection of detailed report, and other related

constraints for developing a strong case that including staffing for the case as detailed

in col 8, line 53-67.

On the other hand, Maxwell teaches identity of the plaintiff, identity of defendant, cause of action, identity of attorney or attorneys [col 3, line 10-49, table 1A-1C, table III, table V], Maxwell specifically directed to case management for clients, attorneys, law office using relational database, particularly creating various relational tables that has unique identifiers such as client ID, attorney ID [see table V], defendant ID [see table III], and like.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Maxwell into legal strategic analysis planning and evaluation control system of Heckman et al. because they are both directed to electronic case management [see Heckman: Abstract, col 5, line 61-67; Maxwell: Abstract, col 2, line 64-67], more specifically Heckman is directed to strategic planning control or computer based legal strategic planning system that dynamically tracking the current legal system that including litigation planning , see col 6, line 24-44, while Maxwell is directed to electronic case management specifically including relational database manager containing various tables that are linked through certain identical and unique fields such as detailed in col 3, line 7-49, table1A-1C,table II-XXVIII, and are both from the same field of endeavor. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combined the references because that would have allowed users of Heckman legal strategic analysis planning and evaluation control system to control, track and obtain necessary information that is automatically generated, further bringing the advantages of classifying required data in a relational

structure and a arranged for managing the data structure to allow users to generate

required necessary documents as suggested by Maxwell, see col 3, line 1-5.

Examiner applies above discussed arguments to dependent claims 63-95 and

97-108.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

a.	US Patent No.	5875431
b.	US Patent No.	6098070

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure

c.	US Patent No.	6430581
d.	US Patent No.	6263351
e.	US Patent No.	6366925
f.	US Patent No.	5991733
g.	US Patent No.	5159180
h.	WO01/020515A1	
i.	US Patent No.	5813009
j.	US Patent No.	6178413
k.	Lexis.Nexis-Learning Lexis-A handbook for modern legal	

research , 1998 pages 12,20,26,31-33,35-37,4750,54

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is

(703) 308-8538. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from

8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time. The TC2100's Customer Service number is

(703) 306-5631.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone

numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned are as

follows:

703/746-7238   **(After Final Communication)**

703/872-9306   **(Offical Communications)**

703/746-7240   **(For Status inquiries, draft communication)**

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is

(703) 305-9600.

sc
Patent Examiner.
October 27, 2003.